

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 7488 Case file # 95-248136.

Material Examiner: Malone (RO)

Remarks:

Case resulted in a trial, testimony transcript not provided.

CRM - 7006

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 11:00 AM (Time), 10/24/02 (Date)

File #: 95-248136

Laboratory #(s): 20225052

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI	<input type="checkbox"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: trial, no transcript provided

Testimony Date(s): _____ Pages: _____

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number:	<u>20225052</u>	Date:	<u>March 17, 1982</u>
Laboratory Number:	_____	Date:	_____
Laboratory Number:	_____	Date:	_____

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ and unidentified technician

Laboratory Number: 20225052

Page 1 of 3

CRM - 7007

Initials: SR

Was any other material reviewed? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: submitting agency letter dated Feb. 17, 1982

Results of Review

File #: 95-248136

Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q22, Q27-Q46, K1, K2, K6-K8

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?
☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

☒ Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 3

Initials: SM

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-248136

#1. It cannot be determined from the notes if the tests were performed in a scientifically acceptable manner.

#2. The results are not adequately documented in the notes. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil instead of ink. Abbreviations are used that are difficult to interpret. The technician fails to document the recovery of hair or fibers from the evidence. The examiner's notes show that many of the fibers were identified as cotton, poly, or nylon but the observed characteristics that led to the examiner's conclusion that these were cotton, poly, or nylon fibers are not documented.

Review completed at: 11:30 AM (Time), 10/24/02 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.5 hrs.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Roberts
(Signature)

Oct. 24, 2002
(Date)

Page 3 of 3

Initials: SR